



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/911,551	07/23/2001	Jeffrey P. Callister	23267-1032	4767
7590 10/06/2003			EXAMINER	
COUDERT BROTHERS LLP			BROWN, MICHAEL A	
ONE MARKET PLAZA			ART UNIT	DADED MUMDED
SPEAR STREET TOWER, SUITE 2100			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			3764	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s) 09/9//55/ Teffrey Cyllister et
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit
	Michael Brow 3764
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—
Period for Reply	2
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SEOF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIREMONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by de	FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ault, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication . statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
☐ This action is FINAL .	
 Since this application is in condition for allowance excacordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 	cept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
Claim(s) 1-42	is/are pending in the application.
	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
.,	is/are allowed.
	is/are rejected.
□ Claim(s)	
☐ Claim(s)	
Application Papers	requirement.
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	wing Review, PTO-948.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ approved □ disapproved.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are o	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are o ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
· ·	ojected to by the Examiner.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	ojected to by the Examiner.
 □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copiest □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial No.) 	ojected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been
 □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Note that the proceived in this national stage application from the 	bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been limber) International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu ☐ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received:	bjected to by the Examiner. er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been limber) International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Note of the Certified copies not received: *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been limber) International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priori ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial No. ☐ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Pap	or. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been imber) International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)). er No(s).
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Note of the Certified copies not received: *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	er. by under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). s of the priority documents have been imber) International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)). er No(s) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-15

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Application/Control Number: 09/911,551

Art Unit: 3764

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this

application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal

disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double

patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,432,116. Although the

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the

claims recited in the present invention are similar in scope and subject matter to the claims recited

in U. S. Patent No. 6,432,116.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Nikolchev and Nuwayser, each discloses a contraceptive device.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Michael Brown whose telephone number is (703) 308-2682.

M. Brown

October 1, 2003

MICHAEL A. BROWN

Michael G.Br

Page 3

PRIMARY EXAMINER